<div align="center">Remarks</div>

Claims 1–27 are pending in the application. Claims 1–27 are rejected. Amendments to the application are shown above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted between Examiner Ke and the Applicant's representative, Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No. 52,580, on January 23, 2008. The Examiner agreed that the amendment to claim 1 above which recites "*displaying the palette in conjunction with the electronic document on the user interface including sizing the palette and resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable such that said palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure viewing of said electronic document*" overcomes the instant § 103 rejections based on references Kotick, Buxton, and Govindarajan. Amendments to claim 14 were also discussed. No agreement was reached as to allowance of the Application. The Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for his time and attention to this matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1–27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotick (U.S. 6,559,867) in view of Buxton (U.S. 6,469,714) and furthermore in view of Govindarajan (U.S. 6,208,659).

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

<div align="right">Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed Oct. 19, 2007
Application Number: 09/770,337
Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01</div>

In the interest of simplifying prosecution of the instant application, the Applicant's reply focuses on the independent claims. Applicant's decision not to address differences between the cited references and every claim limitation of the independent claims or every comment made by the Examiner in regards to the independent claims should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's interpretations and assertions regarding the independent claims.

Also, the patentability of each dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, Applicant's decision not to address the differences between the cited references and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's assertions regarding the patentability of the dependent claims over the cited references.

Claims 1-13

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A method for providing a selection of properties for an electronic document associated with an application program having a user interface, comprising the steps of:

determining a context for the electronic document displayed on the user interface;

determining a status of a property for the electronic document; and

based upon the context of the electronic document and the status of the property,

creating a customized palette for the user interface so that the palette comprises a control only for an available property for the electronic document and excludes controls for unavailable properties for the electronic document; and

displaying the palette in conjunction with the electronic document on the user interface including sizing the palette and resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable such that said palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure viewing of said electronic document, wherein the

displayed palette excludes displayed controls for the unavailable properties for the electronic document.

No new matter has been added to claim 1; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 14, lines 4-20, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed.

Kotick is directed to a configuration system for networked training modules. Kotick describes using a toolbar 50 and a toolbar 70 to select a desired training module icon, such as icon 72 (col. 5, lines 17-30; FIGS. 2, 3, and 4H). The selected training module icon may be dragged to a workstation representation, such as workstation 61, in virtual space 60 to have the training module copied to the workstation (col. 5, lines 29-38; FIGS. 4H-4I).

For the sake of discussion and without admission, the Applicant assumes that the Examiner is asserting that virtual space 60 discloses the Applicant's "electronic document" and toolbars 50 and 70 disclose the Applicant's "palette." FIGS. 4A-4I show toolbars 50 and 70 in a user interface with virtual space 60. However, Kotick fails to disclose resizing virtual space 60. Further, Kotick fails to disclose resizing virtual space 60 to accommodate the displaying of toolbars 50 or 70. Thus, Kotick fails to disclose or suggest "*resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable*" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Buxton is directed to a user interface for applets. Buxton discloses a desktop 300 including an infocenter 320. Infocenter 320 includes action bar 322. Action bar 322 includes action items 324 and main menu items 326 (col. 6, lines 59-67; FIGS. 3A-D and 4A-D).

In Buxton, if the work area is expanded, white space is added to the right side of the action bar (col. 9, lines 55–67). First, Buxton fails to define the meaning of the term "work area." Second, even if one is to assume that Buxton's "work area" discloses Applicant's "electronic document", Buxton discloses expanding the width of the action bar when the work area is expanded. Buxton certainly does not disclose that the work area has been expanded in order <u>to accommodate the displaying of the action bar</u>, but merely describes making the action bar larger to match the expanded work area. Thus, Buxton fails to disclose resizing the work area to accommodate the displaying of the action bar so that the work area and the action bar can be viewed simultaneously. Thus, Buxton fails or suggest "*resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable*" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

The Applicant submits that Govindarajan also fails to disclose or suggest "*resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable*" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Kotick, Buxton, and Govindarajan, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 2 and 4–13 and are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 14-26

Claim 14 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A computer system for providing a selection of formatting properties for an electronic document associated with an application program having a user interface comprising:

a memory for storing a property browser program module; and

a processing unit functionally coupled to the memory for executing computer-executable instructions operable for:

determining formatting properties for an electronic document associated with the application program, wherein a formatting property has an associated control;

determining a context for the electronic document;

creating a customized palette based upon the formatting properties and the context of the electronic document, wherein the customized palette includes controls only for formatting properties that are available to a user and excludes controls for formatting properties that are not available to a user;

coordinating the palette with a toolbar associated with the application program so that the palette provides control features in a same order as corresponding control features in the toolbar; and

sending the palette to a user interface associated with the application program for display adjacent to a viewing content area occupied by the electronic document and for display with the toolbar, such that the palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure any portion of the viewing content area occupied by the electronic document regardless of whether the electronic document occupies all portions of the viewing content area, wherein the displayed palette excludes displayed controls for the unavailable formatting properties for the electronic document.

No new matter has been added to claim 14; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 3, lines 26-30, page 13, lines 26-33, and page 20, lines 8-18, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed.

Kotick, as described above, discloses toolbars 50 and 70 and virtual space 60 in a user interface. For the sake of discussion and without admission, the Applicant assumes toolbar 50 discloses Applicant's claimed "palette" and toolbar 70 discloses Applicant's "toolbar" and virtual space 60 discloses Applicant's "electronic document." In Kotick, selecting icon 53 in toolbar 50 brings up toolbar 70. Toolbar 70 contains icons representing training modules. First, toolbars 50 and 70 do not have corresponding control features (e.g., icons). Second, even if one assumes toolbars 50 and 70 have corresponding control features, Kotick fails to disclose that such corresponding control features are coordinated with each other to be displayed in the same order. Thus, Kotick fails to disclose or suggest "*coordinating the palette with a toolbar associated with the application program so that the palette provides control features in a same order as corresponding control features in the toolbar*" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Buxton, as described above, discloses desktop 300 and action bar 322. Action bar 322 includes action items 324 and main menu items 326. For the sake of discussion and without admission, Applicant assumes Buxton's action items 324 disclose Applicant's "toolbar" and Buxton's main menu items 326 disclose Applicant's "palette."

Buxton discloses that menu items that are corresponding to an action item may mirror the "behavior" of the corresponding action item. For example, if the Paste action item is dimmed, then the Paste menu item may also be dimmed (col. 7, lines 64–67; col. 9, lines 10–12). Arguably, Buxton addresses how an individual menu item may act. However, Buxton discloses nothing about coordinating the order in which menu items appear in relation to the order of corresponding action items. Thus, Buxton fails to disclose or suggest "*coordinating the palette with a toolbar associated with the*

application program so that the palette provides control features in a same order as corresponding control features in the toolbar" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

The Applicant submits that Govindarajan also fails to disclose or suggest "*coordinating the palette with a toolbar associated with the application program so that the palette provides control features in a same order as corresponding control features in the toolbar"* as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Kotick, Buxton, and Govindarajan, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 14. Accordingly, claim 14 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 15-17 and 19-24 and are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 27

Claim 27 as presently amended expressly recites in pertinent part:

"sizing the palette and resizing the displayed electronic document so that the palette and the electronic document can be simultaneously viewed;
coordinating the palette with a toolbar associated with the application program so that the palette provides control features in a same order as corresponding control features in the toolbar."

The Applicant submits that claim 27 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 14 as described above. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

AMENDED CLAIMS 9-11 and 22-24

Claims 9-11 and 22-24 have been amended to correct a typographical error; the term "user interface" has been replaced with "palette." No new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 13, lines 14-15, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed.

NEW CLAIMS 28-29

The Applicant submits no new matter has been added in claims 28 and 29; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 14, lines 16-20, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed. The Applicant submits that claims 28 and 29 are allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims in addition to adding further limitations of their own.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above, it is submitted that all rejections and/or objections to the application have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

     If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension of time fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463. Any overpayment may be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: __January 29, 2008__   By:_____/A. H. Azure/_____

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0399
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed Oct. 19, 2007
Application Number: 09/770,337
Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01